

1 BRUCE L. SIMON (Bar No. 96241)

bsimon@pswlaw.com

2 GEORGE S. TREVOR (Bar No. 127875)

gtrevor@pswlaw.com

3 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**

44 Montgomery Street, Suite 2450

San Francisco, California 94104

Telephone: (415) 433-9000

5 Facsimile: (415) 433-9008

6 MATTHEW A. PEARSON (Bar No. 291484)

mapearson@pswlaw.com

7 **PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP**

15165 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 400

Sherman Oaks, California 91403

Telephone: (818) 788-8300

9 Facsimile: (818) 788-8104

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

13 L.A. Taxi Cooperative, Inc. dba Yellow Cab

Co.; Administrative Services SD, LLC dba

14 Yellow Radio Service; All Yellow Taxi, Inc.

dba Metro Cab; American Cab, LLC;

15 American Cab, LLC dba Pomona Valley

Yellow Cab; Bell Cab Company, Inc.; TM-

16 MTM, Inc.; Big Dog City Corporation dba

Citywide Dispatch, Citywide Taxi, and Big

17 Dog Cab; Cabco Yellow, Inc. dba California

Yellow Cab; C&J Leasing, Inc. dba Royal

18 Taxi; G&S Transit Management, Inc.; Gorgee

Enterprises, Inc.; LA City Cab, LLC; Long

19 Beach Yellow Cab Co-operative, Inc.;

Network Paratransit Systems, Inc.; South Bay

20 Co-operative, Inc. dba United Checker Cab;

Taxi Leasing, Inc. dba Yellow Cab of Ventura

21 County; Tri-City Transportation Systems, Inc.;

Tri Counties Transit Corporation dba Blue

22 Dolphin Cab of Santa Barbara, Yellow Cab of

Santa Maria, and Yellow Cab of San Luis

23 Obispo; and Yellow Cab of South Bay Co-

operative, Inc. dba South Bay Yellow Cab,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 Uber Technologies, Inc.; Rasier, LLC; and

27 Rasier-CA, LLC,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 3:15-cv-01257-JST

**PLAINTIFFS G&S TRANSIT
MANAGEMENT, INC., GORGE
ENTERPRISES, INC., LA CITY CAB,
LLC, AND TRI-CITY
TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS, INC.'S
SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO
DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES,
INC.'S SECOND SET OF
INTERROGATORIES,
INTERROGATORY NO. 5**

1 PROPOUNDING PARTY: DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
 2 RESPONDING PARTY: PLAINTIFFS G&S TRANSIT MANAGEMENT, INC.,
 3 GORGEE ENTERPRISES, INC., LA CITY CAB, LLC, AND
 TRI-CITY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS, INC.
 4 SET NO.: TWO

5 **I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

6 All responses contained herein are based only upon such information and documents
 7 presently available and specifically known to Plaintiffs G&S Transit Management, Inc., Gorgee
 8 Enterprises, Inc., LA City Cab, LLC, and Tri-City Transportation Systems, Inc. ("Plaintiffs"). In
 9 addition, further independent discovery, independent investigation, legal research and/or analysis
 10 may supply additional facts and/or add meaning to the known facts. The responses hereinafter set
 11 forth are given without prejudice to Plaintiffs' right at trial to produce evidence of any
 12 subsequently discovered fact or facts that may later develop.

13 **II. GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

14 Plaintiffs object generally to the Interrogatories on the following grounds, each of which is
 15 incorporated by reference in the responses to the Interrogatories below. All responses set forth
 16 herein are subject to and without waiver of any of these General Objections:

17 1. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories, and any instruction or definition, that purport
 18 to impose obligations on Plaintiffs greater than those imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil
 19 Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

20 2. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories, and any instruction or definition, to the
 21 extent that they call for the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege, the
 22 attorney work product doctrine, and/or information that is otherwise privileged or protected from
 23 discovery (including to the extent that they target confidential financial information).

24 3. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they fail to state with
 25 sufficient particularity the information and categories of information to be provided.

26 4. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they call for Plaintiffs to draw
 27 legal conclusions.

28

1 5. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent they seek to require Plaintiffs to
2 produce all information that supports or otherwise relates to specific contentions in this litigation
3 on the grounds that such contention interrogatories are unduly burdensome and premature at this
4 stage of the litigation. Discovery is not close to completion as the Interrogatories are being
5 answered.

6 6. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories, as well as the definitions and instructions, to
7 the extent the information requested is not relevant to a party's claim or defense.

8 7. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they, or any portion of
9 them, seek information within the possession, custody, or control of any Defendant, or of publicly
10 available information such that the information is obtainable from some other source that is more
11 convenient, less burdensome, or less expensive, or the production of the information will impose
12 undue burden, inconvenience, or expense upon Plaintiffs.

13 8. Plaintiffs object to the Interrogatories to the extent that they seek information that
14 requires an expert opinion. Plaintiffs are entitled to provide evidence that is responsive to the
15 Interrogatories in the form of expert reports at the appropriate time, and no response should be
16 construed to foreclose any such disclosure.

17 9. In responding to these Interrogatories, Plaintiffs do not in any way waive or intend
18 to waive any privilege or objection, but rather intend to preserve and are preserving the following:

19 a) all objections as to the relevancy, materiality, and admissibility of any
20 information sought by any interrogatory;

21 b) all objections as to vagueness, ambiguity or other infirmity in the form of the
22 Interrogatories and any objections based on the undue burden imposed by the
23 Interrogatories;

24 c) all rights to object on any grounds to the use of any of the responses, or their
25 subject matter, in any subsequent proceedings, including the trial of this or any
26 other action;

27 d) all rights to object on any grounds to any further interrogatories or other
28

discovery requests involving or relating to the subject matter of the Interrogatories ;
 e) the right to supplement responses to these Interrogatories prior to trial; and
 f) any and all privileges and/or rights under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or
 other statutes, guidelines or case law.

IV. OBJECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY 5
INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Please precisely identify the geographic area where YOU offer taxi cab services, and if that
 area has changed from March 2009 to present, please specifically identify the changes.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the Preliminary Statement, General Objections, and
 Objections to Definitions set forth above. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that the
 information sought is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product
 doctrine, and/or is otherwise privileged and/or protected from discovery. Plaintiffs further object
 to the extent the information is publically available and, thus, equally available to the Defendants.
 Plaintiffs further object to the phrases “precisely,” “specifically,” and “the geographic area where
 YOU offer taxi cab services” as vague and ambiguous. The use of the terms “precisely” and
 “specifically” renders this request unduly burdensome. Plaintiffs will respond with the specificity
 required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing
 orders, and orders of this Court.

Subject to and without waiving all general and specific objections, Plaintiffs respond as
 follows:

Plaintiffs G&S Transit Management, Inc., Gorgee Enterprises, Inc., and Tri-City
 Transportation Systems, Inc. provide taxi cab services in Glendale, Burbank, and Pasadena.

Plaintiff L.A. City Cab, LLC provides taxi cab services in the City of Los Angeles.

Plaintiff Network Paratransit Systems, Inc. provides taxi cab services in the County of
 Santa Barbara.

///

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the Preliminary Statement, General Objections, and Objections to Definitions set forth above. Plaintiffs further object to the extent that the information sought is protected by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine, and/or is otherwise privileged and/or protected from discovery. Plaintiffs further object to the phrase “the geographic area where YOU offer taxi cab services” as vague and ambiguous because it does not specifically request that Plaintiffs respond with each and every city where Plaintiffs are licensed to operate, dispatches rides to, and actually picks up passengers who hail a taxi within a specific city. Rather, Plaintiffs interpret the request in the only manner in which they are reasonably able to respond, which is to identify the areas in which they are licensed to operate; that being where they have been granted a license by a controlling authority. Furthermore, the use of the terms “precisely” and “specifically” also renders this request unduly burdensome because it would require Plaintiffs to go through each and every dispatch record for the relevant time period. Plaintiffs will respond with the specificity required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, the Civil Local Rules, the applicable standing orders, and orders of this Court.

Subject to and without waiving all general and specific objections, Plaintiffs supplement their previous response as follows:

Plaintiffs G&S Transit Management, Inc., Gorgee Enterprises, Inc., and Tri-City Transportation Systems, Inc. provide taxi cab services in the County of Los Angeles including all unincorporated areas of the County and in the following cities within the county: Alhambra, Arcadia, Azusa, Baldwin Park, Bradbury, Burbank, Covina, Duarte, El Monte, Glendale, Glendora, Hacienda Heights, Industry, Irwindale, La Canada, La Puente, Monrovia, Montebello, Monterey Park, Pasadena, Pomona, Rosemead, San Gabriel, Sierra Madre, South Pasadena, Temple City, and West Covina.

Plaintiff L.A. City Cab, LLC provides taxi cab services in the County of Los Angeles including all unincorporated areas of the County and in the following cities within the County: Agoura Hills, Arleta, Baldwin Hills/Crenshaw, Boyle Heights, Calabasas, Canoga Park,

1 Chatsworth, Encino, Granada Hills, Los Angeles, Mission Hills, North Hollywood, Northridge,
2 Pacoima, Panorama City, Porter Ranch, Reseda, San Fernando, Studio City, Sunland, Sun Valley,
3 Sylmar, Tarzana, Toluca Lake, Tujunga, Valley Glen, Valley Village, Van Nuys, West Hills,
4 Westlake Village, Winnetka, and Woodland Hills.

5
6 DATED: July 8, 2016

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP
BRUCE L. SIMON
GEORGE S. TREVOR
MATTHEW A. PEARSON

7
8
9 By: /s/ George S. Trevor
10 GEORGE S. TREVOR
11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2450
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104

VERIFICATION

I, Jano Baghdanian, declare:

I hereby state that I am General Manager for G&S Transit Management, Inc., Gorgee Enterprises, Inc., LA City Cab, LLC, Network Paratransit Systems, Inc., and Tri-City Transportation Systems, Inc. I am authorized to make this verification on behalf of G&S Transit Management, Inc., Gorgee Enterprises, Inc., LA City Cab, LLC, Network Paratransit Systems, Inc., and Tri-City Transportation Systems, Inc. in this action.

I have read the foregoing **PLAINTIFFS G&S TRANSIT MANAGEMENT, INC., GORGEE ENTERPRISES, INC., LA CITY CAB, LLC, AND TRI-CITY TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS, INC.'S SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.'S SECOND SET OF INTERROGATORIES, INTERROGATORY NO. 5** and hereby declare that the responses are true to and correct to the best of my personal knowledge, information, and belief, with the exception of those matters upon which I have relied on the investigation of counsel, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. I reserve my right to supplement or revise this statement based upon any subsequently discovered documents or information.

Executed at Sun Valley, CA on July 11, 2016.


Jano Baghdanian

PEARSON, SIMON & WARSHAW, LLP
44 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 2450
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94104